BULLETIN

American Association of School Social Workers

VOL. XVIII JUNE, 1943 No. 3

SOCIAL CHANGE AND CASE WORK

by

Ruth Smalley, Associate Professor of Social Case Work, School of Applied Social Sciences, The University of Pittsburgh

In a time of great struggle, with human and social values being denied and defended at such tremendous cost, it is imperative that all men give thought to the conduct of their own lives, and to the establishment of those values by which they will to live, and for which they may need to die. For members of a profession whose whole concern is man's social opportunity and social relationships this imperative includes an examination of their own practice to see what it expresses and must express of human and social values if it is to make its right contribution in these crucial years. My purpose in this paper is to examine some aspects of the current practice of social case work, to see what is reflected there of broader social change and perhaps to suggest some ways in which the practice of our profession may further the attainment of what we as a people believe to be a right and good way of living.

There is no longer any denying that that something has become crystalized as a relatively well defined "new" in social case work purpose and process. To some currently practicing case workers this newness may represent a change in philosophy or objective; to others the translation of an objective already held into reliable action through the use of a concept of a frame work of function for practice, and through the definition of principles applied in a process.

For some time there have been dissatisfactions within the profession itself, uncertainties and questionings as to purpose and method. How much what is new in social case work is due to the case workers own dissatisfaction with her practice and her search for a surer method to accomplish a more clearly defined objective, and how much it is a re-

flection of social change would be difficult to say and perhaps unimportant But it may profit to examine the nature of the new and to see if it is related to other social phenomena of this period in any important ways.

Whenever we examine what is new and see it in the light of an old to which we feel it is superior, we tend to assume the amused and slightly smug expression of those who found "the old three cornered hat, and the breeches and all that . . . so queer." In today's reflections on case work we shall do well to remember the words of Mary Richmond who herself looked back to outworn ways in social work and ahead to better ways than she or her period would be able to achieve. In deploring the activities of the old district visitor, ancestor of the friendly visitor, herself the ancestor of today's case worker, Miss Richmond wrote, "Brewing a bit of broth for an aged cottager, reading beside her sick bed, sewing a warm garment for Peggy or Nancy, it is thus that our ancestors lightly skimmed the surface of social conditions,"[1] and added, "It would ill become us to speak alightingly of the work of those who have handed down to us a precious freight of human sympathy and tenderness."[2]

Any advance in the practice of social work is the fruit of the concern and effort of all who have engaged in it ,and serves only as a new orientation for the contribution of this profession toward the achievement of its old purpose . . . a better world.

What I see as an emphasis that is new and desirable in social case work today can be summed up quite briefly: The practice of case work is coming to reflect something that includes but goes beyond tenderness, compassion, concern for the individual in trouble to a genuine respect for him and belief in his strength . . . to a will which has been translated into practice, that whatever self determination is possible for him within the limits imposed by temporarily unalterable conditions shall be furthered in the manner in which the case work service is offered . . . a recognition that unless case work service is made available *in this way,* we as case workers are working against forces within the individual which are essential if the kind of world in which we say we believe is to endure. Is this new as a concept, No. As practice, Yes.

Mary Richmond wrote in 1898: "To ignore the importance of character and the discipline that makes character is a common fault of modern philanthropy . . . character in the rich who owe the poor justice, as well as mercy; and character in the poor who are masters of their fate to a greater degree than they will recognize or we will recognize for

[1]Richmond, Mary *Friendly Visiting Among the Poor.* Page 194.
[2]Ibid.

them . . . insofar as our charitable work affects it, let us see to it that we do our part in restoring a tone of sturdy self-reliance and independence to the commonwealth.[3]

Edward Denison, volunteer almoner in 19th century London, deplored what he felt in his practice to be contradictory to his purpose . . . "Every shilling I give away does four pence worth of good by helping to keep their miserable bodies alive and eight pence worth of harm by helping to destroy their miserable souls."[4]

Alexander Johnson, English born social worker who contributed so much to social work in this country, wrote: "The danger of doing for people what they ought to do for themselves is always present . . . and this applies not only to material things . . . but there is a higher pauperism, that of the mind and spirit, not always seen as a danger. It may be even worse to destroy independence of thought and feeling than self-reliance for material support."[5] And again . . . "Only what we earn by exertion or purchase by sacrifice does us any good. Nature gives us nothing for nothing. What we do not pay for in effort we pay for in deterioration."[6]

Through the wisdom of these and other social workers practicing before the coming in of this century, we can understand how it was that the bread of charity came to be known as bitter, why it was "hated and feared by the decent poor" of Johnson's own Lancashire . . . and this *because* as Johnson wrote . . . "the taste for alms seems like the tiger's taste for human blood."[7]

Now probably every social case worker practicing today would claim as her social purpose in the alleviation of distress caused by psychological or social conditions the furthering of the client's activity in his own behalf, but as measured by our practice that has not been our purpose, or if it has, we have frequently defeated the end by the means we took to achieve it.

Acknowledging that old almsgiving was practiced for the glory and salvation of the giver rather than out of any genuine consideration for the one in need or for the good of the group of which he and the giver were members, and repudiating this practice of spiritual profiteering on human misery, we arrive at the day when the well being of the individual in need was the theoretical consideration. I say theoretical and I mean

---

[3]Richmond, Mary. Op. cit. Page 9.

[4]Quoted by Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell as recorded by Richmond, Mary, "Social Diagnosis" Page 27.

[5]Richmond, Mary. *Social Diagnosis.* Page 29.

[6]Johnson, Alexander. *Adventures in Social Welfare.* Page 177.

[7]Ibid. Page 33.

under actual so far as the understanding of the practitioner made such consideration possible. The early part of this century saw attempts on the part of the case workers to further "self help," but the method was collection of data *about* an individual frequently without his knowledge or consent, formulation of a plan for his betterment and an attempt to enlist his interest and anticipation in it.

Did this reflect a poor means of helping the individual achieve the fullest possible realization of himself around a specific problem or did it reflect an unrecognized lack of respect for him and belief in him . . . a Mother Knows Best attitude of however a benevolent and loving mother . . . an assumption that the client was unable to keep the direction of his own life in his own hands before he had had an opportunity to give evidence for or against such an assumption. Excerpts from "First Interviews," quoted Mary Richmond's *Social Diagnosis* we read, without too much ill advised superiority, I hope, in the light of what shall presently be presented.

"The real problem is to keep the client from gravitating to the source of his trouble until one is ready to have him. This is achieved by keeping up a rapid interchange of firm but kind questions and answers, allowing no time for lapses of attention on the part of the person interviewed."[8]

And again the case worker asks a "deserted wife," in speaking of her husband to her . . . "Was he willing to marry you or did he do it against his will?"[9] a question which can be considered only impertinent since it seemed to stem not from any attempt to help the client determine what in this situation she wished to do in respect to life with or without her husband, but from the case worker's need to know in order that she might formulate some plan which *she* considered desirable for the client. What could be more destructive of the integrity of the client and her rights as a human being? What worker could change places with the client comfortably in any such worker-client relationship. The basic assumption in the best social case worker of the day despite the professed purposes of its leaders seemed to be that the client, by virtue of being a client, had forfeited his right to privacy in his personal affairs, and to his own thinking and willing and living, making whatever use of the case worker his capacity and her skill might permit.

Now we come to a later day, and its sun is still at high noon . . . when a psychological plan was conceived by the worker and superimposed on the client regardless of his request or wish, just as were other though different plan of earlier days. What is reflected in the commonly heard "recipe" for case work "treatment" (as it may be called), "Make the

[8]Richmond, Mary. *Social Diagnosis*. Page 465.
[9]Ibid. Page 463.

client *think* it is his plan"? How much more honest respect for the client would be implied should it become necesary for the worker to represent a plan counter to his will if she said frankly, "This is not your plan; it is mine, necessary because of the function I represent," with opportunity for him to express his feelings around this plan—not his—and to work on whatever choices might be possible for him within its limits. Such terms as "ego massage"—"flattering the ego of the client" reflect an insincerity, a patronizing and subtle kind of none-the-less domination with "Mother Knows Best" still in the saddle.

In a recently published book dealing with the practice of social case work we find, "Again we have an illustration of the worker's *willingness* (underlining mine) to leave as much responsibility as possible in Mr. H's hands"[10] Willingness? What different attitude might have been reflected through substitution of the word *capacity* for willingness? Is it a question of the worker's exercise of a benevolent *will* to permit another individual to carry his own responsibility or is it a question of her recognition of his right to carry that responsibility up to the point that he demonstrates that he is unable to carry it to such degree that serious damage to himself, to his family, or to society is involved, and action must be taken counter to his wishes.

And again—"The worker has no clerical collar, no bottles and X-rays, no diploma or license, not even a title that is recognized by the lay person as representing competence. For other professions these devices serves somewhat the same purposes as our concrete services."[11] What is the ulterior purpose? What do we have in mind for the client of which he is not aware? What is the nature of the web into which we are seeking to entice him? A psychological "make-over" without his knowledge and against his will? Just as our forbears had in mind an environmental "make-over" which was not the client's choice? It is the purpose in the mind of the case worker, not shared with the client, which has come to make the term case worker sometimes synonymous with trickery. Hence the fear of being "case-worked" expressed by students and workers in relation to each other and in relation to their supervisors,—the fear of the undisclosed purpose of the other in relation to oneself— different from the ostensible reason for the coming together.

This same writer in another part of her book records: "There has been much aimless drifting in recent years because we have just wandered on amiably letting people talk without any clear idea of why or toward what end,"[12] and again, "She (the worker) may do him (the client) inestimable harm in taking over responsibility for areas of his life which

[10]Hollis, Florence. *Social Case Work in Practice.* Page 31.
[11]Hollis, Florence. Page 225.

he is quite competent to handle."[12] So that the conscious *purpose* of the writer, as here implied, and of the group of practicing social workers for whose point of view she speaks . . . is the offering of agency service in such a way as to further the client's responsible use of himself in respect to the problem he brings. But this conscious purpose, apparently can exist side by side with a method which may defeat its attainment.

Quite recently a class in social case work was discussing some case material which reflected a forthright, direct and skillful offering of agency service, client and worker being clear as to what service was being offered and under what conditions. At the end of the discussion a staff worker who had been sitting puzzled and silent throughout the discussion said with real wonderment, "This worker treated this client as an equal." A commentary on some of our case work practice?

If we feel a genuine respect for the integrity of the client and for his *right* to make his own decisions and choices in using agency services within the limits of what the agency has to offer and the terms on which it can be offered, certain principles of practice will follow.

First we shall be concerned to help the client articulate what it is he wishes from the agency. This may involve some time and *must* involve genuine consideration and feeling for him and for his feeling around the proble mhe brings and around coming to the agency for help with it. This concern to help the client explore his problem, what he wants to do about it and how he wants to use the agency toward its solution will supplant the worker's concern to determine the client's "real problem" as over against the one of which he is aware and for which he is seeking help. This latter endeavor has frequently led us to several preliminary interviews during the course of which we assured the client that the solution of his problem (presumably *our* solution, not his) would take time and in a sense begged his indulgence to give us that time in order that we might put things right for him. He was frequently confused as to the direction the interviews were taking since the content of the discussion was usually ,to him, irrelevant to what he was requesting, and often he left before a process was completed which though entered upon in his behalf had somehow left him outside. It is posible to help the client explore whether what he first expresses a wish for in the way of service represents his real wish, represents the service desired by the most responsible, capable willing part of himself. But the essential is that this exploration be the client's with the worker's help; not the worker's with the client's help. And therein lies the tale.

---

[12]Hollis, Florence. Op. cit. Page 294.
[13]Hollis, Florence. Op. cit. Page 296.

In the second place if our respect for the integrity of the client is genuine we will be concerned to know and to state directly and simply whether what the client asks of us we have as agency to offer in the way of service, whether that service consists of the providing of maintenance relief, temporary financial assistance, foster home care for children, counseling in relation to school, job placement or other.

This involves a thoughtful clarification as agency staff of agency purpose, or function, agency services available for a realization of that purpose and agency policy which shall define the terms upon which the services are available. When therapy is the purpose of the case worker in respect to the client it makes little or no difference to her what the purposes and policies of her agency are. She offers pretty much the same diffuse service whether she is functioning in a juvenile court, school social work department, family or children's agency, using as she does the services of her specific agency as tools to accomplish some more total result. She is in a sense a law unto herself and the focus of her "treatment" is in her person and skill as therapist rather than in the function of her agency, as Dr. Taft has said in clarifying the distinction between case work and therapy.[14] This concept of case work as therapy has consequently resulted in indifference on the part of staff members toward the formulating of agency policies since each worker has wanted to roll her own. She has preferred to make individual decisions as to whether it was best for the "adjustment" of the individual client that she give money or withhold it, ask an own parent to contribute to the cost of foster home care for his child or not ask him. The terms on which services were given or withheld were not clear to the client who could not but feel caught in a situation over which he had no control, engaged in a game whose rules were known to the other fellow but not to him, as surprised and confused as to his part in the matter when he got safely back home (with the bacon) as when he was tagged out. Only one rule may gradually have become clear to him. I recall one worker saying to me with some bitterness in the early days of psychoanalytic influence in the practice of case work when weekly interviews of an hour each were the rule if supplementary financial assistance was to be given. "Now you have to *talk* for your money." And there was a not far distant time when the best talkers got the most money.

Parenthetically may I say in respect to the current therapy and case work controversy, it is my personal conviction, for whatever it is worth, that case workers can operate as therapists only when they are prepared

[14]Taft, Jessie. "Function as the Basis of Development in Social Work Process" The News Letter A. A. P. S. W.—Vol. IV. No. 1.

professionally to be therapists, when the agency service includes the offering of therapy and when worker and client know that what is being engaged in is therapy.

When the case worker operates with the focus of the process in the function of the agency, it is imperative that she knows what the function of the agency is, what service the agency has to offer, and on what terms it is available. Acceptance of this second corollary of real respect for the integrity of the client will call for a speed up in policy making on the part of most private agencies. Public agencies, particularly relief giving public agencies are making a splendid contribution in the clear formulation of purpose and policies and in the frank discussion with the client of the terms on which the help requested can be granted. In a recent visit to a district office of a large public agency I noted pamphlets[15] available for distribution to clients which stated clearly the conditions of eligibility for the various kinds of assistance, as well as the social purpose underlying the requirement of relative responsibility and the use of property resources. The bread of charity loses some of its bitterness when the client through his own activity can establish his right to have it for his own sake and for the sake of the group of which he is a vital and important part as the worker. He need not choke it down through the necessity to free a certain part of the community from fear of pestilence and revolution, or to save the worker's soul through giving her a chance to do a good deed, or to enable the worker to engage in a kind of practice which constitutes the price he must pay for his groceries.

It is understandable that some clients may have come to prefer being helped by the public rather than the private agency because they could keep their self respect through engaging in a process which entitled them to assistance as a right on terms which they could understand. But this need not, in fact I would like to say *must* not, continue to characterize a difference in the practice of public and private agencies. Private agencies, too, can help the client engage in a process and meet certain conditions which entitle him to service as a right.

We will be able to limit what we offer the client and to make clear the conditions on which we offer it insofar as we have a genuine respect for the client's rights as a person which precludes our intruding, even for his good, in matters with which he has not sought our help.

There will be clients who come to us not of their own free will, but who none the less must have us for awhile because their activities cannot be tolerated by society (of which, again, they are a part) whether that

[15] *Department of Public Assistance, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.* "Informational Leaflets," 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

society is represented by the Juvenile Court, the public school or other. And there are patients in hospitals for whom the doctor requests service in order that their return to health or their social use of themselves within the limitations of certain physical handicaps may be facilitated. Here, too, as Elizabeth De Schweinitz has pointed out[16] there is room for choice as to what the individual *may* do with our help about his situation and what he *must* do to conform to a limit we represent. Our skill lies in our stimulating his interest in his own change, in participating in that change, and in recognizing when there is neither will nor capacity to change and in then representing whatever action we as agency must take efficiently, responsibly, and with consideration for the feelings of the client around this limit to his self determination.

In the third place, genuine respect for the integrity of the client as an individual and for his capacity to move in his own behalf will involve us not only in helping him articulate what he wants of us as agency, and in formulating and articulating to him whether we have what he wants and if so on what terms, but it will involve us in learning a process through which we can make available to him the service he requests in such manner as to further his most responsible functioning in that limited area.

Now whence came this new? Because it is a new to most case work practice. The fact, that however and wherever it was first and most clearly formulated, it is now finding expression in widely separated localities suggests that the field of social work was ready to understand and use it.

"More powerful than the sword is an idea whose time has come."[17]

But I am asking now, specifically, whether and how a point of view about case work which I have presented is related to social change. Recent social change seems to me to reflect *first,* an increasing concern that the welfare of the individual be established as a right and defended under the law; *second,* an increasing emphasis on the value or good in individual freedom of action within limits, clearly defined and subject to change by orderly procedure and not by the exercise of personal whim —limits necessary for the greatest possible freedom of choice and action of the greatest possible number; and *third,* the realization of what is necessary in individual character, and something of how that character may be developed, if the democratic way of life as represented by the above concepts is to endure. Recent social change reflects the emergence

[16]DeSchweinitz, Elizabeth. "Advantages and Disadvantages of a Muliple Service Agency." Part I, *The Compass,* November, 1940.

[17]Source unknown. Quoted at International Conference of Social Work, 1928.

of these concepts and their translation into action, and also, a struggle against them. In brief, throughout the world those of us who believe in one way of life are struggling to defend it, and out of that struggle we are impelled to sharpen our thinking about what it is we are defending and what it takes both to realize and defend it.

The increasing concern that the welfare of the individual be guaranteed as a right and defended under the law is reflected in the social legislation of this and other countries over the last fifty years. Laws governing the granting of public assistance and having to do with child welfare, housing, city planning, public health, sanitation, public education and public recreation, regulation of public morals, labor legislation, social insurance, all reflect the will of the people that all individuals shall have guaranteed to them as rights such social conditions as shall make possible their own fullest self realization and their most creative contribution to the society they constitute.

The movement for collective bargaining is a reflection of the determination that what is basic for creative social living shall not be accepted as a hand out but must be granted as a right. And this movement in itself has done much to establish the right of all individuals to have what, materially at least, is essential for good living, and has struck a hard blow at the concept that right's reposing in and depending upon the benevolent will of some other. Now it is the concept of the right of the individual to have what it is socially good for him to have which is reflected in the current practice of social case work. It is no longer a case of the client's saying, "Give it to me because I want it;" or "Give it to me because I need it;" but rather, "It is my right to have it because I meet the conditions which entitle me to it." In the last analysis, these conditions must insure that the client's having the agency service or commodity is good for him as a member of the group to which we all belong. Briefly, it seems to me to be the social value of the service to the client or rather the capacity he demonstrates to make a social use of it which makes it his right.

During the course of this paper I have referred to and shall refer to the client's "right" to services or to the possibility of his establishing right. Edith Abbot in a recent article[18] answers that question in the following way "in the language of wise lawyers . . . yes and no. The old poor laws undoubtedly gave such a right to all persons who were in need, and it is also clear that this right is mandatory. But even mandatory laws can not be enforced if the proper authorities fail to provide the funds

[18]Abbot, Edith. "Is There a Legal Right to Relief."
Social Service Review-- Vol. 12, Page 260

that are necessary to carry them out. "Miss Abbot's belief in the necessity to abolish or rewrite the old pauper laws to bring them more into line with the special forms of aid under the Social Security Act, which provide for an appeal and a hearing if the request ofr aid is refused, reflects her attitude that human beings are morally entitled to certain services as a right and that this moral right should be insured through its being established as a legal right. When I speak of the client's right to services whether of a public or private agency, I am thinking of that right as a moral right, a right dictated by humanity and the interest of men in his fellow man and by a concern for the well being of all individuals who constitute our society—a moral right which must be established as a legal right when that is feasible. There is, of course no right of appeal if private agency services are refused a client partly because the number of clients who can be served by the private agencies and the extent to which they can be served are limited by agency budgets. Nevertheless, the recognition by the case worker in the private agency of the moral right of the client to whatever services are available, provided eligibility is established by the clients' giving evidence through his own efforts that he can make a responsible social use of such services, reflects an *attitude* which can be translated into policies that shall apply to all alike, the same *attitude* as the one which actuates those who wish to establish the *moral* right to relief as a *legal* right.

And the concept of the value in individual freedom of action within limits is necessary for the greatest possible freedom of action of the greatest possible number. There is a need for self realization in men which resents domination and rises to overthrow it. Perhaps it is the same thing that in the sunflower seed represents the impulse to become a sunflower, weather permitting, that cannot be willed, wheedled, loved or analyzed into an impulse to become a rose. There is a deep healthy will toward self fulfillment in each of us, and it has been evidenced so long as evidence has been. Whenever external conditions bore too heavily on the possibility of the individual spirit to achieve its own personal and social destiny, there have been revolutions. That morning in June in 1215 A.D. when a group of barons met King John at Runnymeade to compel him to give up the exercise of some of his autocratic authority was just one manifestation, and far from the first one, of the will of the human spirit to resist tyranny.

"The intention of the men who drew up the charter was to state the law as it should be. It is the first detailed statement of feudal law, the first clear agreement between the king and his barons as to the exact demands which the king can make on them and which they can make on

their men, whether barons or simple free men."[19] It is suspected that King John's barons were actuated by pure self interest and were perhaps quite unaware of and disinterested in the moral good in the principle which they were embodying in a written agreement. Nevertheless, the document that resulted expressed the principle of a limit to the control that one individual, as an individual may have over another.

The policies of social agencies written down and made clear to clients—if they are policies instituted in the interest of the welfare of the clients—can constitute the Magna Charta of Social Work today . . . the agreement between the client and the agency which guarantees that the service he received and the conditions under which he receives them shall be established in policy, not subject to the personal whim of the individual social worker, and that within the limits of agency policy and regulation he shall have freedom of choice and action to live his own life in his own way.

Case work today represents frank and honest dealing with no cards up the sleeve. It operates from rules (policies) which guarantee the client rights, appreciating his right to privacy in his personal affairs, and recognizing the worker's responsibility to limit herself to offering only those services falling within the function of her agency and requested by the client. This does not preclude the worker's offering of services which seem to be what the client might make use of, if he knew they were available. As a matter of fact, I see it as the woker's responsibility to be alert to what the client is struggling to express a wish for, to help him articulate it more clearly, and to anticipate and make available services which seem appropriate for him in his situation. But whether or not he wishes these services is something to be discussed with him. Schools, clinics and other community resources will not be visited without his knowledge, his undertsanding of the purpose of such visits in the administration of the service he is requesting of the agency, and his expressed wish or agreement that such visits be made. When agency function makes it necessary for the worker to take action counter to the client's wishes, today's case worker is equally frank with him about this, being clear with him as to choices still available, and recognizing his right to his feelings about action she must take. Case work today involves cooperating with the client in *his* plan so long as it is a socially constructive plan whose furtherance falls within the function of a specific agency—and not trying to involve the client, however skillfully, in cooperating with the worker in *her* plan. We have long given lip service to the client's right to self-determination. We have not always practiced it.

[19]*Encyclopaedia Britanica.* "Magna Charta."

And the third characteristic of social change . . . the realization of what is necessary in character, and something of how to achieve that character if the democratic way of life is to prevail. Changing practices in education are reflecting an awareness of the importance of the child's learning to exert effort to achieve what he wants, to do his own thinking, to make his own unique contribution, to behave responsibly with consideration for the rights of others if he is to be prepared to be a citizen of a democracy. Because we have been sensitive to the great deprivations many of our clients have known, our first impulse has been to make up to them by giving them, with no strings attached and nothing required on their part, all that we had as agency to give, and more, too. We failed to recognize that this was a disservice to the client. We weakened him by our pity rather than strengthened him by our belief in him. We lost an opportunity to rekindle or to keep alive the forces in him that must struggle if he is to survive. We substituted *our* strength, *our* courage, *our* resourcefulness for his in the conduct of his own life. We can ease pressures that are too great; we can offer resources which the client can use for his own strengthening, but in our very process we must anticipate and facilitate the client's taking hold of his own problem. Only so do we reflect any genuine respect for him. - Only so do we help him become the kind of citizen we must all become if we are to make work that most difficult and most glorious of all social structures . . . a democracy where the rule is one for all and all for one. And if we fail, in the practice of our own profession to help our clients realize their most responsible selves, we will have had quite a part in what we may some day face—the grim realization that when it came to defending as a people what we believed in, we just did not have it.

Now this concept of facilitating the client's use of his own strength in his own behalf can be used cruelly and without imagination. And if it is so used, it is just one more bag of tricks. But it need not be. It *can* be used with deep understanding and warm human concern, with sensitive appreciation of how courage and kindliness can fail under repeated blows of tragic circumstance, with constant awareness of how much this client *can* put in at this time, and how much and what kind of activity the *worker* can put in to help him.

We will never find any substitute in the practice of case work for genuine feeling for human beings in trouble and the wish to serve them. It is our very feeling for them which impels us, at some pain to ourseleves, to change our way of serving them if a better way is found. Nor does this new way of helping imply that we no longer need to understand the dynamics of human behavior. Deeper understanding is required by the

worker, of both the client and herself, and of the nature of the case work relationship if she is to make her services available in a way conducive to the client's most responsible use of them.

So it is that social change and awareness of need for further social change in this world crisis may be affecting the practice of social case work.

But, as I have suggested, I am of the opinion that while certain changes in the practice of social case work may have some relation to broader social change, there has been something stirring within the profession itself which is resulting in its own correction.

Most social workers really care about people. In our professional capacities, we want to serve people well. We have grasped at any new understanding which seemed to hold promise of serving them better. That is why we truned so enthusiastically to psychoanalysis for understanding. What we have learned from psychoanalysis and what we hope we shall continue to learn from it has made and can make us better case workers. What we did for awhile, as Miss Marcus has said, was to take over not just the understanding of people, our clients and ourselves, to which psychoanalysis has made such rich contribution but the techniques of psychoanalysis which are appropriate for the purposes of psychoanalysis but not appropriate for the purposes of social case work.[20] Most of us have realized this and have asked ourselves even before a straitened public asked us. What are we being paid to do? What is our responsibility to our clients, to our community? Are the methods we are employing the best ones to accomplish the social agency purpose with which we are entrusted?

Most of us have turned away from a kind of practice for which we had little competence and have come to a new respect not only for clients as people but for ourselves as social case workers who do not need for our own dignity and worth to be anything other than social case workers. Because a well defined process is now available to be learned we can take pride in mastering what is ours to achieve our own ends.

In reviewing "The Christian Criticism of Life" by Lynn Harold Hough, Mr. Wilson wrote, "The book defies the dictum of Rousseau that man born free is everywhere in chains. The dean proclaims that man loses cubits from his stature if he is subjected to influences which he is impotent to direct and control. Like a refrain throughout the volume sounds a clarion salute to man's unfettered intelligence, his ability to do this and leave that undone ,to fulfill his personality by initiative and effort. Emancipation from the discipline of conscience and the claims of duty,

[20]Marcus, Grace. "Changes in the Theory of Relief Giving." *Social Work Today,* June-July, 1941.

the surrendering of the will to decide and believe, abandonment of the heritage accumulated by countless generations of builders . . . all of these are summed up in the thesis that man thus abdicates his appointed throne."[21]

The social case worker can, through the responsible carrying out of her own function, and in relation to the clients she serves . . . help to keep on his appointed throne the only man who belongs there . . . Everyman.

---

[21]Wilson, P. W. "Review of the Christian Criticism of Life" by Lynn Harold Hough. *New York Times, Book Review,* November 2, 1941.

It is regretted that results of balloting for national officers are not available. Due to cancellation of National Conference of Social Work in Cleveland, Ohio, May 24-28, annual business meeting could not be held.

Extra copies of bulletin, 15c.

Grace L. Bebb, Chairman, Bulletin Committee, Hughes High School, Cincinnati, Ohio.